

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

---

BENJAMIN J. COLEMAN,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No. 22-C-1292

HOUSE OF CORRECTIONS,

Defendant.

---

**SCREENING ORDER**

---

Plaintiff Benjamin J. Coleman, who is currently serving a state prison sentence at the Waupun Correctional Institution and representing himself, filed a complaint under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, alleging that his civil rights were violated. This matter comes before the Court on Plaintiff's motion for leave to proceed without prepayment of the filing fee and to screen the complaint.

**MOTION FOR LEAVE TO PROCEED WITHOUT PREPAYMENT OF THE FILING FEE**

Plaintiff has requested leave to proceed without prepayment of the full filing fee (*in forma pauperis*). A prisoner plaintiff proceeding *in forma pauperis* is required to pay the full amount of the \$350.00 filing fee over time. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1915(b)(1). Plaintiff has filed a certified copy of his prison trust account statement for the six-month period immediately preceding the filing of his complaint, as required under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(2), and has been assessed and paid an initial partial filing fee of \$22.06. Plaintiff's motion for leave to proceed without prepaying the filing fee will be granted.

## SCREENING OF THE COMPLAINT

The Court has a duty to review any complaint in which a prisoner seeks redress from a governmental entity or officer or employee of a governmental entity, and dismiss any complaint or portion thereof if the prisoner has raised any claims that are legally “frivolous or malicious,” that fail to state a claim upon which relief may be granted, or that seek monetary relief from a defendant who is immune from such relief. 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(b). In screening a complaint, the Court must determine whether the complaint complies with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and states at least plausible claims for which relief may be granted. To state a cognizable claim under the federal notice pleading system, Plaintiff is required to provide a “short and plain statement of the claim showing that [he] is entitled to relief.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a)(2). It must be at least sufficient to provide notice to each defendant of what he or she is accused of doing, as well as when and where the alleged actions or inactions occurred, and the nature and extent of any damage or injury the actions or inactions caused.

“The pleading standard Rule 8 announces does not require ‘detailed factual allegations,’ but it demands more than an unadorned, the-defendant-unlawfully-harmed-me accusation.” *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009) (quoting *Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 555 (2007)). “The tenet that a court must accept as true all of the allegations contained in a complaint is inapplicable to legal conclusions. Threadbare recitals of the elements of a cause of action, supported by mere conclusory statements, do not suffice.” *Id.* A complaint must contain sufficient factual matter, accepted as true, to “state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face.” *Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 570. “A claim has facial plausibility when the plaintiff pleads factual content that allows the court to draw the reasonable inference that the defendant is liable for the misconduct

alleged.” *Id.* at 556. “[T]he complaint’s allegations must be enough to raise a right to relief above the speculative level.” *Id.* at 555 (internal quotations omitted).

#### **ALLEGATIONS OF THE COMPLAINT**

Plaintiff is an inmate at the Waupun Correctional Institution. Dkt. No. 1. Defendant is the Milwaukee House of Corrections (HOC). *Id.* at 1. In July 2020, Plaintiff was housed in the HOC segregation unit for about 3 weeks without any personal hygiene items. *Id.* at 2-3. Plaintiff alleges that he repeatedly asked “segregation staff” to give him hygiene items, specifically a “dental hygiene kit,” but he did not receive anything in response. *Id.* He claims that, as a result, his front right tooth chipped, causing low self-esteem and depression. *Id.*

#### **THE COURT’S ANALYSIS**

“To state a claim for relief under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, a plaintiff must allege that he or she was deprived of a right secured by the Constitution or the laws of the United States, and that this deprivation occurred at the hands of a person or persons acting under the color of state law.” *D.S. v. E. Porter Cty. Sch. Corp.*, 799 F.3d 793, 798 (7th Cir. 2015) (citing *Buchanan–Moore v. Cty. of Milwaukee*, 570 F.3d 824, 827 (7th Cir. 2009)). Section 1983 limits liability to public employees who are personally responsible for a constitutional violation. *Burks v. Raemisch*, 555 F.3d 592, 593-94 (7th Cir. 2009). “An official satisfies the personal responsibility requirement of section 1983 . . . if the conduct causing the constitutional deprivation occurs at [his] direction or with [his] knowledge and consent.” *Gentry v. Duckworth*, 65 F.3d 555, 561 (7th Cir. 1995) (quoting *Crowder v. Lash*, 687 F.2d 996, 1005 (7th Cir. 1982)). He must know about the conduct and facilitate it, approve it, condone it, or turn a blind eye.” *Id.* (quoting *Jones v. City of Chicago*, 856 F.2d 985, 992 (7th Cir. 1988)).

In this case, Plaintiff only names the HOC as a defendant. The HOC is a “non-suable entity” because it is a building and not a “person” capable of being sued under § 1983. *See Smith v. Knox Cty. Jail*, 666 F.3d 1037, 1040 (7th Cir. 2012). Toward that end, Plaintiff does not identify anyone specific that was personally involved in denying his request for hygiene items. *See* Dkt. No. 1 at 2-3. Plaintiff’s assertion that “segregation staff” were involved is not specific enough to give potential defendants notice of the claim against them. In short, Plaintiff’s complaint fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted. If Plaintiff wishes to proceed with this lawsuit, he must (1) file an amended complaint that identifies the individual or individuals responsible for the complained of conduct; (2) list the individual(s) in the caption of the amended complaint, and (3) explain what each individual did to allegedly violate Plaintiff’s rights. In other words, Plaintiff must clearly set forth the who, what, when, and where of what he alleges occurred. If Plaintiff files an amended complaint, the Court will screen it as required by 28 U.S.C. § 1915A. If Plaintiff does not file an amended complaint, the Court will dismiss this case.

The Court is enclosing a guide for *pro se* prisoners that explains how to file an amended complaint that the Court can effectively screen as well as a blank prisoner amended complaint form. The Court will require Plaintiff to use that form to file his amended complaint. *See* Civil L.R. 9 (E.D. Wis.). Plaintiff is advised that the amended complaint must bear the docket number assigned to this case. The amended complaint replaces the prior complaint and must be complete in itself without reference to the other complaint. *See Duda v. Bd. of Educ. of Franklin Park Pub. Sch. Dist. No. 84*, 133 F.3d 1054, 1056-57 (7th Cir. 1998). In *Duda*, the appellate court emphasized that in such instances, the “prior pleading is in effect withdrawn as to all matters not restated in the amended pleading.” *Id.* at 1057 (citation omitted).

**IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED** that Plaintiff's motion for leave to proceed without prepayment of the filing fee (Dkt. No. 2) is **GRANTED**.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that the complaint is **DISMISSED** because it fails to state a claim. Plaintiff may file an amended complaint that complies with the instructions in this order by **February 19, 2023**. If Plaintiff files an amended complaint by the deadline, the Court will screen it as required by 28 U.S.C. § 1915A. If Plaintiff does not file an amended complaint by the deadline, the Court will dismiss this case.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that the Clerk's Office mail Plaintiff a blank prisoner amended complaint form and a copy of the guide entitled "Guide to Filing Prisoner Complaints Without a Lawyer in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Wisconsin" along with this order.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that the agency having custody of the prisoner shall collect from his institution trust account the **\$327.94** balance of the filing fee by collecting monthly payments from Plaintiff's prison trust account in an amount equal to 20% of the preceding month's income credited to the prisoner's trust account and forwarding payments to the Clerk of Court each time the amount in the account exceeds \$10 in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 1915(b)(2). The payments shall be clearly identified by the case name and number assigned to this action. If Plaintiff is transferred to another institution, the transferring institution shall forward a copy of this order along with Plaintiff's remaining balance to the receiving institution.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that copies of this order be sent to the officer in charge of the agency where the inmate is located.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that plaintiffs who are inmates at Prisoner E-Filing Program institutions must submit all correspondence and case filings to institution staff, who will

scan and e-mail documents to the court. The Prisoner E-Filing Program is mandatory for all inmates of Green Bay Correctional Institution, Waupun Correctional Institution, Dodge Correctional Institution, Wisconsin Secure Program Facility, Columbia Correctional Institution, and Oshkosh Correctional Institution. Plaintiffs who are inmates at all other prison facilities must submit the original document for each filing to the Court to the following address:

Honorable William C. Griesbach  
c/o Office of the Clerk  
United States District Court  
Eastern District of Wisconsin  
125 S. Jefferson Street, Suite 102  
Green Bay, WI 54301

PLEASE DO NOT MAIL ANYTHING DIRECTLY TO THE COURT'S CHAMBERS. It will only delay the processing of the matter.

Plaintiff is further advised that failure to make a timely submission may result in the dismissal of this action for failure to prosecute. In addition, the parties must notify the Clerk of Court of any change of address. Failure to do so could result in orders or other information not being timely delivered, thus affecting the legal rights of the parties.

Dated at Green Bay, Wisconsin this 20th day of January, 2023.

s/ William C. Griesbach  
William C. Griesbach  
United States District Judge